

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/757,431	01/10/2001	Bruce G. Lindsay	CA9-2000-0014/1851P	8483
7590 12/03/2003			EXAMINER	
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP P.O. Box 51418			LY, ANH	
Palo Alto, CA 94303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2172	
		•	DATE MAILED: 12/03/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

M

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/757,431	LINDSAY ET AL.	
navioury nation	Examiner	Art Unit	
*	Anh Ly	2172	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence addre	ss
THE REPLY FILED 10 November 2003 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of thi 1) a timely filed amendm	s application. A proper reply tent which places the application	to a on in
PERIOD FOR R	REPLY [check either a) or	(b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Oftimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	s Advisory Action, or (2) the dat e later than SIX MONTHS from AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONT ne date on which the petition ur d of extension and the correspo of the shortened statutory perio- ffice later than three months af	the mailing date of the final rejection THS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. Solution of the appropriate amount of the fee. The appropriate of the reply originally set in the final Of	ee MPEP  wriate extension originate extension ffice action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	FR 1.191(d)), to avoid dis	-	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furt	her consideration and/or	search (see NOTE below),	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
<ul><li>(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	in better form for appeal	by materially reducing or simp	olifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding nur	mber of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE:		·	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s):		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	ld be allowable if submitte	ed in a separate, timely filed a	mendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: S		en considered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed S	OLELY to issues which were	newly
7 🖂 For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims v			d an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	3:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14,56 and 57</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) ap	proved or b) disappro	oved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper	· No(s)	
10. Other:	,		0)

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicants' argured that, "In particilar, neither reference teaches or suggests "issuing a callback to the data manager" and "continuing to carry out an index-data fetch for another data identifier if ... the index manager receives a specific condition from the data manager in response to the callback," as recited in claims 1 and 8." (Page 4, the 3rd and 5th paragraphs, Page 6, the 3rd paragraph) and "Edwards does not teach or suggest" a callback to the data manager." (page 8, the last paragraph).

Edwards discloses issuing a callback and carying out an index-data fetch for another data identifier and a callback to the data manger (see figs 3A and 3C and search next index function and record file manager (RMF): col. 7, lines 10-20 and col. 8, lines 35-59). Thus, Applicants' argumants are not persuasive.

KIM VU

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100